

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ANDERSON/GREENWOOD DIVISION

Rahmad Norman, <div style="text-align: right;">Plaintiff,</div> <div style="text-align: center;">v.</div> Commission of Public Works, Greenwood, <div style="text-align: right;">Defendant.</div> <hr style="width: 40%; margin-left: 0;"/>)))))))))))	C/A No. 8:13-732-TMC ORDER
--	---	--

Plaintiff, proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, filed this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. This matter is before the court for review of the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (“Report”), made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. See *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objections are made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the magistrate judge’s recommendation, or recommit the matter with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Plaintiff was advised of his right to file objections to the Report. (ECF No. 11 at 5). However, Plaintiff did not file any objections. In the absence of objections, this court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the magistrate judge’s recommendation. See *Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Rather, “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo

review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case, including the complaint, the court adopts the Report (ECF No. 11) and incorporates it herein. It is therefore **ORDERED** that the complaint (ECF No. 1) is **DISMISSED** without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Timothy M. Cain
United States District Judge

Anderson, South Carolina
April 30, 2013